*J. Fluid Mech.* (2023), v*ol*. 977, A15, doi:10.1017/jfm.2023.983



# The '−1' decay law for some small-scale quantities at large Péclet numbers and fixed Reynolds numbers

S.L. Tang $^{1, +}$ , R.A. Antonia<sup>2</sup> and L. Djenidi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center for Turbulence Control, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, 518055, PR China

2School of Engineering, University of Newcastle, NSW 2308, Australia

3Department of Mechanical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology - Bombay, Powai, Mumbai 400076, India

(Received 28 March 2023; revised 16 October 2023; accepted 16 November 2023)

The effect of a uniform mean scalar gradient on the small scales of a passive scalar field in statistically stationary homogeneous isotropic turbulence is investigated through the transport equation for the scalar fluctuation. After some manipulation of the equation, it is shown that the effect can be recast in the form  $S_{\theta}^{*}Pe_{\lambda_{\theta}}^{-1}$  ( $S_{\theta}^{*}$  is the non-dimensional scalar gradient,  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$  is the turbulent Péclet number). This effect gradually disappears as  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$  becomes sufficiently large, implying a gradual approach towards local isotropy of the passive scalar. It is further argued that, for a given  $S^*_{\theta}$ , the normalized odd moments of the scalar derivative tend towards isotropy as  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}^{-1}$ . This is supported by direct numerical simulations data for the normalized odd moments of the scalar derivative at large Péclet numbers. Further, the present derivation leads to the same prediction (∼*Sc*−0.<sup>45</sup> where *Sc* is the Schmidt number) as Buaria *et al.* (*Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 126, no. 3, 2021*a*, p. 034504) and complements the derivation by the latter authors, which is based on dimensional arguments and the introduction of a new diffusive length scale.

Key words: turbulence theory

## 1. Introduction

The skewness of the scalar derivative  $S_3$ , define[d as](mailto:shunlin.tang88@gmail.com)

$$
S_m = \frac{\overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^m}}{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}, \quad m = 3,
$$
\n(1.1)

† Email address for correspondence: shunlin.tang88@gmail.com

[where](#page-12-5)  $\theta$  $\theta$  $\theta$  [is](#page-12-2) the [scala](#page-12-6)r fluctuatio[n](#page-12-3) [and](#page-12-3) *m* is a po[sitive](#page-12-7) integer, is [gener](#page-12-4)ally of order 1 [when](#page-12-8) the Schmidt num[ber](#page-12-9)  $Sc(\equiv \nu/\kappa, \nu)$  is the kine[matic](#page-12-10) visc[osity a](#page-11-0)nd  $\kappa$  is the [diffus](#page-12-11)ivity of the s[calar\) is](#page-11-1) of order 1 [in she](#page-12-12)ar flows such as wakes, jets and homogeneous shear flows (e.g. Mestayer *et al.* 1976; Gibson, Friehe & McConnell 1977). This has been interpreted as evidence that local isotropy of the passive scalar field is violated (e[.g. Me](#page-12-7)stayer *et al.* 1976; S[reeniv](#page-11-2)asan & Antonia 1977; Sreenivasa[n, Ant](#page-11-3)onia & Britz 1979; Sreeniva[san &](#page-12-13) Tavoularis 1[980; S](#page-12-14)ubramanian & Antonia 1982; S[reeniv](#page-12-15)asan 1991; Ho[lzer &](#page-12-16) Siggia 1994; [Pumir](#page-11-1) 1994; Tong [& W](#page-12-12)arhaft 1994; Sreenivasan & Antonia 1997; Shraiman & [Siggi](#page-12-11)a 2000; Warhaft [2000;](#page-11-1) Yeung, Xu & Sre[enivas](#page-12-12)an 2002; Yeung, Donzis & Sreenivasan 2005; Monin & Yaglom 2007; Yeung & Sreenivasan 2014; Clay 2017; Sreenivasan 2019; Buaria *et al.* 2021*a*; Shete *et al.* 2022). On the other hand, there is evidence that, as *Sc* increases from approximat[ely 10](#page-11-1)−<sup>3</sup> to 103, <sup>|</sup>*S*3<sup>|</sup> along a direction parallel to the mean scalar gradient first increases before decreasing with increasing *Sc* (e.g. Yeung *et al.* 2002; Antonia & Orlandi 2003; Brethouwer, Hunt & Nieuwstadt 2003; Schumacher & Sreenivasan 2003; Yeung *et al.* 2004; Donzis, Sreenivasan & Yeung 2005; Yasuda *et al.* 2020; Buaria *et al.* 2021*a*; Shete *et al.* 2022). In particular, [using d](#page-11-1)imensional arguments, Sreenivasan (2019), Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*) and Shete *et al.* (2022) derived relations for  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$ . Each of these quantities was found to decrease with *Sc* as  $Sc^{-1/2}$  at a given  $Re_\lambda$ . However, this behaviour was not supported well by the dir[ect](#page-12-17) [nu](#page-12-17)merical simu[lation](#page-11-4)s (DNS) data of Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*) at  $Re<sub>\lambda</sub> = 140$  over a significant range  $Sc = 1-512$ ). Here,  $Re<sub>\lambda</sub>$  is the Taylor microscale Reynolds number defined by  $u_1^2$  $\frac{1}{2}$  $\lambda/\nu$ , where  $\lambda$  is the longitudinal

Taylor microscale defined by  $\lambda = u_1^2$  $\sqrt{\frac{(\partial u_1/\partial x_1)^2}{(\partial u_1/\partial x_1)^2}}$  and *u<sub>i</sub>* is the fluctuation velocity in the *xi* direction. Further, Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*) introduced a new diffusive length scale in their dimensional analysis and obtained <sup>∼</sup>*Sc*−0.45, which is supported reasonably well by their DNS data for  $\textit{Sc}\gtrsim4.$  We recall that Obukhov (1949) and Corrsin (1951) assumed that the small scales of a passive scalar introduced in a turbulent flow are isotropic in space and stationary in time at sufficiently high Péclet numbers. In this paper, the turbulent Péclet number  $Pe_{\lambda_\theta}$  is defined as

<span id="page-1-0"></span>
$$
Pe_{\lambda_{\theta}} = \frac{\overline{u_1^{2}}^{1/2} \lambda_{\theta}}{\kappa},
$$
\n(1.2)

where  $\lambda_{\theta}$  ( $\equiv \frac{\theta^{2}}{\theta^{2}} \sqrt{(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1)^2}^{1/2}}$ ) is the Corrsin microscale. However, it is not clear whether the influence of large-scale forcing, such as that due to the action of the mean scalar gradient on the small-scale anisotropy, is negligible when the Péclet number is not sufficiently large. A knowledge of how and at what rate the small scales of a passive scalar approach isotro[py with](#page-11-1) increasing  $Pe_{\lambda}$  is of significant importance. For example, local isotropy can significantly simplify the mo[de](#page-2-0)lling of small scales since one component is generally sufficient to represent all other components. Therefore, the main objective of this paper is to examine how small-scale anisotropy evolves as  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$  increases. We first examine how large-scale forcing associated with the mean scalar gradient affects the local anisotropy of the passive scalar and how this anisotropy evolves with  $Pe_{\lambda\phi}$ . Then, the available data for  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  in the literature are interpreted in the light of the present results. In particular, the relations for <sup>|</sup>*S*3|, <sup>|</sup>*S*5<sup>|</sup> and <sup>|</sup>*S*7|, i.e. <sup>∼</sup>*Sc*−0.45, proposed [by](https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2023.983) [Buaria](https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2023.983) *et al.* (2021*a*), will be compared with the present results.

This paper is structured as follows. In  $\S 2$ , we derive and test the relations between the large-scale forcing associated with the mean scalar gradient and the local anisotropy of the passive scalar. A comparison between the dependence of |*S*3|, |*S*5| and |*S*7| on *Sc*, *viz.*

<span id="page-2-1"></span>*The* −1 *decay law*

<span id="page-2-0"></span><sup>∼</sup>*Sc*−0.<sup>45</sup> proposed by Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*), and the present results is discussed in § 3. Conclusions are given in § 4.

#### 2. Theoreti[cal co](#page-12-18)nsiderations and discussions

The dynamical equation for the scalar fluctuation  $\theta$  is given by Corrsin (1952) as

$$
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + \bar{U}_j \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_j} + u_j \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial x_j} + u_j \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_j} - u_j \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_j} = \kappa \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_j},
$$
(2.1)

where  $\Theta$  is the mean scalar;  $\bar{U}_i$  is the mean velocity in the  $x_i$  direction. Sreenivasan & Tavoularis (1980) derived a transport equation for  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_1)^3$  in a steady, homogeneous shear flow with uniform mean velocity and scalar gradients in the *x*<sub>2</sub> direction ( $\partial \bar{U}_1/\partial x_2 =$ const. and  $\partial \Theta / \partial x_2$  = const.). Using a similar procedure as Sreenivasan & Tavoularis (1980), we first differentiate (2.1) with respect to  $x_\alpha$  ( $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ ), then multiply the resulting equation by  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_{\alpha})^n$  and finally take the average to obtain

$$
\frac{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \bar{U}_{j}}{\partial x_{\alpha}} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{j}}} + \bar{U}_{j} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{j}}} + \overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n} \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{j}}} + \overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n} u_{j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j}}} + \overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n} \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{j}}} + \overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n} \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{j}}} + \overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n} \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j}}} + \overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n} \frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j}}} + \overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x
$$

Since [we co](#page-2-1)nsider only the statistically stationary case, we have

$$
\overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial t}} = \overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}} = \frac{1}{n+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n+1} = 0.
$$
 (2.3)

In this paper, we focus on the passive scalar field convected by statistically stationary homogeneous isotropic turbulence under a uniform mean scalar gradient in the *x*<sup>1</sup> direction (∂Θ/∂*x*1). Therefore, the last two terms on the first line and the second term on the second line of ([2.2\)](#page-2-1) can be ignored. Further, since the flow is homogeneous, we have

$$
\overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n}u_{j}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{j}}} = \frac{1}{n+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j}}\overline{u_{j}}\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n+1}} = 0, \qquad (2.4)
$$

<span id="page-2-2"></span>
$$
\overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\overline{u_{j}}\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{j}} = \overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\frac{\partial\overline{u_{j}\theta}}{\partial x_{j}} = 0.
$$
 (2.5)

Finally, (2.2) reduces to

-

$$
\overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n}\frac{\partial u_{1}}{\partial x_{\alpha}}}\frac{\partial\Theta}{\partial x_{1}}=-\overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n}\frac{\partial u_{j}}{\partial x_{\alpha}}}\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{j}}+\kappa\overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{\alpha}}\right)^{n}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{\alpha}}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j}}\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_{j}}.
$$
(2.6)

The left-hand side term is the (large-scale) mean scalar-gradient production. The two terms on the right side are the small-scale terms, which can be interpreted as representing the production and destruction of  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_{\alpha})^{n+1}$  respectively. Note that, when  $\partial \Theta / \partial x_1 = 0$  and

 $n = 1$ , (2.6) is the stationary form of the equation for  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_{\alpha})^2$  first written by Corrsin (1953). The equation, which contained both mean velocity and mean scalar-gradient terms, was teste[d](#page-2-2) [by](#page-2-2) Abe, Antonia & Kawamura (2009) in a turbulent channel flow at different Reynolds numbers. Wyngaard (1971) considered (2.6) with *n* = 1. He interpreted the first term on the right side [of](#page-2-2) (2.6) as the production rate of  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_{\alpha})^2$  due to the stretching of the temperature field by the turbulent strain field, which is balanced by the molecular smoothing of the gradient temperature field. Since (2.6) contains both large- and small-scale terms, it can be used to quantify the effect of the large-scale forcing associated with the mean scalar gradient on small-scale quantities. When *n* is even and  $\alpha = 2$  or 3, the first term in (2.6) is zero if local isotropy is satisfied since all combinations of the indices in  $\overline{(\partial \theta / \partial x_{\alpha})^n (\partial u_1 / \partial x_{\alpha})}$  will lead to the Kronecke[r delta](#page-11-5)  $\delta_{1\alpha}$  ( $\alpha = 2$  [or 3\) u](#page-12-19)nder the assumption of local isotropy. As an example, th[e firs](#page-2-2)t term in (2.6) for  $\alpha = 2$  and  $n = 2$ can be written as

$$
\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_2} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_2} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_2} \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial x_1} = \frac{3}{4} \left( \delta_{12} \delta_{22} + \delta_{12} \delta_{22} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{12} \delta_{22} \right) \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1} \left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^2 \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial x_1} = 0, \quad (2.7)
$$

after using the isotropic form of a single-point [fou](#page-2-2)rth-order velocity derivative tensor (∂*ui*/∂*xj*)(∂θ/∂*xn*)(∂θ/∂*xm*) (e.g. Antonia & Browne 1983; Wyngaard 2010). When *n* is odd and  $\alpha = 2$  or 3, the first term in (2.6) is also zero if local isotropy is satisfied since all combinations of the indices in  $\overline{(\partial \theta/\partial x_{\alpha})^n(\partial u_1/\partial x_{\alpha})}$  will lead to the Kronecker delta  $\delta_{1\alpha}$  ( $\alpha = 2$  or 3) or the permutation symbol  $\epsilon_{1\alpha\alpha}$  or  $\epsilon_{\alpha\alpha\alpha}$  under the assumption of local isotropy. Therefore, in (2.6), we only consider the subscript  $\alpha =$ 1, which represents the direction of the mean scalar gradient. After normalization by  $\sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}$ <sup>(*n*+1)/2</sup>  $\sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}$ , the first term in (2.6) becomes

$$
\frac{\overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^n \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1} \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial x_1}}{\overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}^{(n+1)/2} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}^{(n+1)/2}} = \frac{\overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^n \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1} \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial x_1}}{\overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}^{(n+1)/2} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}^{(n+1)/2} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}^{(n+1)/2} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}^{(n+1)/2} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}^{(n+1)/2}} \right\}, (2.8)
$$
\n
$$
\frac{R_n \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial x_1}}{\overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}^{(n+1)/2}} = \frac{R_n 6 \kappa \overline{\theta^2}^{1/2} \overline{u_1^2}^{1/2} \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial x_1} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial\theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^2}^{(n+1)/2}} = \frac{6R_n S_\theta^*}{P e_{\lambda_\theta}}
$$

where  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$  is defined in (1.2);  $S^*_{\theta}$  is defined as

<span id="page-3-0"></span>
$$
S_{\theta}^* = \frac{\overline{\theta^2}^{1/2} \overline{u_1^2}^{1/2} \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial x_1}}{\overline{\epsilon}_{\theta}},
$$
(2.9)

with  $\bar{\varepsilon}_{\theta} = 6\kappa (\partial \theta / \partial x_1)^2$ ; for convenience, we refer to  $S_{\theta}^*$  as the non-dimensional scalar gradient. Here,  $R_n$  is the normalized correlation involving the streamwise derivative of  $\theta$ and  $u_1$ , defined as

$$
R_n = \frac{\overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^n \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1}}}{\overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^{2^{n/2}} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1}\right)^{2^{1/2}}}}.
$$
(2.10)

977 A15-4

*The* −1 *decay law*

Finally, after normalization by  $\overline{(\partial \theta/\partial x_1)^2}^{(n+1)/2} \overline{(\partial u_1/\partial x_1)^2}^{1/2}$ , (2.6) for  $\alpha = 1$  can be rewritten as 6*RnS*<sup>∗</sup>

<span id="page-4-0"></span>
$$
\frac{iR_n S_\theta^*}{Pe_{\lambda_\theta}} = A_n,\tag{2.11}
$$

where  $A_n$  is defined as

$$
A_n = \frac{-\overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^n \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_1} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_j}} + \kappa \overline{\left(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1}\right)^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_j}}{(\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1})^2}.
$$
(2.12)

The n[umerat](#page-12-7)or of  $A_n$  is simply the right-hand side of (2.6) with  $\alpha = 1$ . In that respect,  $A_n$ represents the normalized sum of the production and destruction of  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_1)^{n+1}$ . Some remarks are warranted on the use of  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_1)^2$ , which is one of the three components in the full scalar dissipation rate defined as  $2\kappa (\partial \theta / \partial x_i)^2$ , in equations (2.11) and (2.9). The values of  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_i)^2$  along the direction[s per](#page-4-0)pendi[cular](#page-3-0) to the mean scalar gradient, i.e. the  $x_2$  and  $x_3$  directions, should be equal becau[se of t](#page-4-0)he symmetry. On the other hand, Yeung *et al.* (2002) showed that the ratio of parallel-to-perpendicular scalar-gradient variances (i.e.  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_1)^2 / (\partial \theta / \partial x_2)^2$  and  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_1)^2 / (\partial \theta / \partial x_3)^2$ ) is close to unity (their table III or figure 11*a*). In particular, this ratio is equal to 1.05 at  $Sc = 1$  and  $Re<sub>\lambda</sub> = 140$  and 240, respectively (their table III). This implies that local isotropy is satisfied adequately in the context of the ratio of parallel-to-per[pend](#page-4-0)icular scalar-gradient variances in this flow and justifies the use of  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_1)^2$  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_1)^2$  $(\partial \theta / \partial x_1)^2$  in (2.11) and (2.9). It is worth mentioning that local isotropy does not require  $R_2$ ,  $R_4$  and  $R_6$  in (2.11) to be zero. For example,  $R_2$ , the mixed velocity-scalar derivative skewness, represents the production of  $\bar{\epsilon}_{\theta}$  generated by stretching of the scalar field as a result of the turbulent strain ra[te. Fu](#page-4-0)rthe[r,](#page-4-0) [for](#page-4-0)  $n = 2, 4, 6$  and when local isotropy is satisfie[d, any](#page-4-0) combination of the indices in  $A_2$ ,  $A_4$  and  $A_6$  will lead to a term involving the permutation symbols  $\epsilon_{111}$ ,  $\epsilon_{11j}$  or  $\epsilon_{1ji}$ , which are zero. Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded from  $(2.11)$  that, due to the presence of the mean shear,  $A_2$ ,  $A_4$  and  $A_6$  may not be 0 at finite  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$  and thus the flow is anisotropic in the context of *A*2, *A*<sup>4</sup> and *A*6. Therefore, (2.11) provides a relation between the mean scalar gradient and the local anisotropy. Namely, since, regardless of whether local isotropy is satisfied, the large-scale production term (the term on left-hand side of  $(2.11)$ ) is non-zero and the corresponding small-scale terms  $(A_2, A_4 \text{ and } A_6 \text{ in } (2.11))$  are zero when local isotropy is assumed, we can use (2.11) to quantify the effect of the large-scale forcing caused by the mean shear on the degree of isotropy of the small scales. Specifically, the relation shows how the level of local anisotropy depends on the magnitudes of  $S^*_{\theta}$ ,  $Pe_{\lambda_{\theta}}$  and  $R_n$ for  $n = 2$ , 4 and 6. If  $R_n S_\theta^*$  for  $n = 2, 4, 6$  does not increase as rapidly as  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$ ,  $A_2$ ,  $A_4$  and  $A_6$  should then go to zero when  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$  is sufficiently large, irrespective of the magnitude of  $S^*_{\theta}$ . In particular, for a given  $S^*_{\theta}$ , if  $R_n$  for  $n = 2, 4, 6$  are constant,  $A_n$  will behave as  $Pe_{\lambda_{\theta}}^{-1}$  in statistically stationary homogeneous isotropic turbulence with a uniform mean scalar gradient. Figure 1(*a*) shows the distributions of  $S^*_{\theta}$  and  $R_2$  in statistically stationary homogeneous isotropic turbulence with a uniform mean scalar gradient at  $Re<sub>\lambda</sub> = 38$ . We [can observe tha](https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2023.983)t the magnitude of  $R_2$  decreases slightly as *Sc* increases for  $Sc \lesssim 10$  and appears to be approximately constant for  $Sc \gtrsim 10$ . Similarly, the magnitude of  $S^*_{\theta}$  increases as *Sc* increases for  $Sc \lesssim 10$  and also becomes approximately constant for  $Sc \gtrsim 10$ . We thus can conclude that  $A_2$  should behave as  $Pe_{\lambda}^{-1}$  for  $Sc \gtrsim 10$ . It is worth mentioning

that the values of  $R_4$  and  $R_6$  in this flow are not available. However,  $R_2$ ,  $R_4$  and  $R_6$  can be related to the normalized high-order moments of scalar derivatives via the following Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities:

<span id="page-5-0"></span>
$$
\overline{\left| \left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1} \right|} \le \overline{\left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^4}^{1/2} \overline{\left( \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1} \right)^2}^{1/2} \Rightarrow |R_2| \le \frac{\overline{\left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^4}^{1/2}}{\overline{\left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^2}} = F_{\parallel 4}^{1/2}, \quad (2.13a)
$$

$$
\overline{\left| \left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^4 \right| \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1}} \le \overline{\left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^8}^{1/2} \overline{\left( \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1} \right)^2}^{1/2} \Rightarrow |R_4| \le \frac{\overline{\left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^8}^{1/2}}{\overline{\left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^2}^2} = F_{\parallel 8}^{1/2}, \quad (2.13b)
$$

$$
\overline{\left| \left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^6 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1} \right|} \le \overline{\left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^{12}}^{1/2} \overline{\left( \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1} \right)^{2}}^{1/2} \Rightarrow |R_6| \le \frac{\overline{\left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^{12}}^{1/2}}{\overline{\left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x_1} \right)^{2}}^{3}} = F_{\parallel 12}^{1/2}, \quad (2.13c)
$$

where  $F_{\parallel 4}$ ,  $F_{\parallel 8}$  and  $F_{\parallel 12}$  are the normalized 4th, 8th and 12th moments of scalar derivatives along the direction parallel to the mean gradient. The inequalities in (2.13) imply that the magnitudes of  $R_2$ ,  $R_4$  and  $R_6$  should not exceed those of  $F_{\parallel 4}$ ,  $F_{\parallel 8}$  and  $F_{\parallel 12}$ . Figure 11(*c*) of Yeung *et al.* [\(2002\)](#page-6-0) ( $Sc = 0.25{\text -}64$ ) shows that the flatness of scalar derivatives along directions parallel ( $F_{\parallel 4}$ ) and perpendicular ( $F_{\perp 4}$ ) to the mean gradient are approximately constant for  $Sc > 10$  at  $Re<sub>\lambda</sub> = 38$ . Also, at a higher  $Re<sub>\lambda</sub>(= 140)$ , figure 8 of Buaria *et al.*  $(2021a)$   $(Sc = 1-512)$  shows that the normalized 4th, 6th and 8th moments of scalar derivatives along directions parallel ( $F_{\parallel 4}$ ,  $F_{\parallel 6}$  and  $F_{\parallel 8}$ ) and perpendicular ( $F_{\perp 4}$ ,  $F_{\perp 6}$  and  $F_{\perp 8}$ ) to the me[an](#page-4-0) [gra](#page-4-0)dient approach each other and become independent of *Sc* for *Sc*  $\gtrsim 8$ . Based on this information, for the normalized moments of the scalar derivatives and the inequalities in  $(2.13)$ , it seems reasonable to assume that  $R_4$  and  $R_6$  become independent of *Sc*, like  $R_2$  (figure 1*a*), for  $Sc > 10$ . In this situation, we can conclude that  $A_4$  and  $A_6$ , like  $A_2$ [, should b](#page-6-0)[ehave](#page-12-7) as  $Pe_{\lambda\theta_1}^{-1}$  for  $Sc \gtrsim 10$ .

We recall that  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  are frequently used to test local isotropy of a passive scalar. In this context, it is interesting to examine whether  $|S_3|, |S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  will follow the prediction (2.11), equivalently whether  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  will follow  $A_n \sim Pe_{\lambda}^{-1}$  for  $n = 2, 4, 6$  for  $Sc \gtrsim 10$ . Although  $A_n$  and  $|S_m|$  are different small-scale quantities, they have some features in common. For example, they both are strongly affected by the uniform mean scalar gradient; they both quantify the degree of local anisotropy of the passive scalar. Figure 1(*b*) shows the distributions of  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  vs  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$ , using the data of Yeung *et al.* (2002). In order to obtain the values of  $Pe_{\lambda\rho}$ , we have used the following relation:

<span id="page-5-2"></span><span id="page-5-1"></span>
$$
\frac{Pe_{\lambda_{\theta}}}{Re_{\lambda}} = \left(\frac{6ScR_{\theta}}{5}\right)^{1/2},\tag{2.14}
$$

where the time scale ratio  $R_{\theta}$  can be rewritten as

$$
R_{\theta} = \frac{\overline{\theta^2}/\overline{\varepsilon}_{\theta}}{\overline{q^2}/\overline{\varepsilon}} = \frac{\overline{\theta^2}\overline{\varepsilon}}{3\overline{u_1^2}\overline{\varepsilon}_{\theta}} = \frac{\frac{\overline{\varepsilon}L}{u_1^{2/2}}}{\frac{3\overline{\varepsilon}_{\theta}L}{u_1^{2/2}\overline{\theta^2}}} = \frac{C_{\varepsilon}}{3C_{\varepsilon\theta}},
$$
(2.15)

<span id="page-6-0"></span>

Figure 1. (*a*) Dependence of  $S^*_{\theta}(\nabla, \text{blue})$  and  $R_2(\bullet, \text{red})$  on *Sc* for  $Re_{\lambda} = 38$ . (*b*) Dependence of  $|S_3|(\bullet, \text{blue})$ ,  $|S_5|$  (**▼**, red) and  $|S_7|$  (◆) at  $Re_\lambda = 38$ . Lines:  $\sim Pe_{\lambda_\theta}^{-1}$ . The horizo[ntal arro](#page-12-15)ws in (*a*) and (*b*) indicate the region in which  $R_2 \approx const$  and  $S_\theta^* \approx const$ . To plot (*a*) and (*b*), we have used the DNS data of Yeung *et al.* (2002); see text for deta[ils.](#page-12-7)

where *L* is the int[egral](#page-12-7) length scale. The parameters  $C_{\varepsilon}$  and  $C_{\varepsilon\theta}$  at  $Re_{\lambda}=38$  and  $Sc=$ 0.25–64 are calculated from table 1 of Donzis *et al.* (2005). Note that, at  $Pe_{\lambda\theta} = 121$  (or [equivale](#page-6-0)ntly *Sc* = 16), there are two values of  $|S_m|$  at each *m* (=3,5,7) (see figure 12 of Yeung *et al.* 2002), corresponding to two simulations at different spatial resolutions, i.e.  $k_{max} \eta_B = 1.48$  and 2.95 (see table I of Yeung *et al.* (2002); here,  $k_{max}$  is the resolved highest wavenumber and  $\eta_B$  is the Batchelor length scale). In figure 1(*b*), the values of  $|S_m|$  at  $k_{max} \eta_B = 1.48$  are not sh[own s](#page-4-0)ince small values of  $k_{max} \eta_B$  [would r](#page-11-6)esult in an underestimation of the magnitude of  $|S_m|$ ; for example, this can be obs[erved from](#page-7-0) table III of Yeung *et al.* (2002) in the context of  $|S_3|$  and  $|S_4|$  at  $Sc = 16$  $Sc = 16$ . We can observe from figure 1(*b*[\) tha](#page-5-1)t  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  [a](#page-11-1)nd  $|S_7|$  ex[hibit](#page-11-1) a tendency to behave as  $Pe_{\lambda_\theta}^{-1}$  for  $Sc > 10$  (or equiva[lently](#page-12-15)  $Pe_{\lambda\theta} > 91$ ). [N](#page-5-2)amely, the flow approaches local isotropy as  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}^{-1}$  in the context of  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$ .

We [now exam](#page-7-0)ine whether the behavi[ours](#page-11-1) [of](#page-11-1) |*S*3|, |*S*5| and |*S*7| [follow](#page-7-0) [th](#page-7-0)e behaviours of  $A_2$ ,  $A_4$  and  $A_6$  (or the prediction (2.11)) at  $Re_\lambda = 140$ . Buaria *et al.* (2021*b*) show that  $C_{\varepsilon\theta}$  decreases as *Sc* increases from 1 to 512 at  $Re_{\lambda} = 140$  (see their figure 2, which was digitized to replot  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  vs  $Pe_{\lambda_\theta}$ ). Figure 2 shows the distributions of  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  of Buaria *et al.* [\(2021](#page-6-0)*a*) as a f[unc](#page-7-0)tion of  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$ . To replot the data we [used](#page-4-0) (2.14) and (2.15) with  $C_{\varepsilon} = 0.46$  (estimated using data in table 1 of Donzis *et al.* (2005) at  $Re_\lambda = 140$ ) and the values of  $C_{\epsilon\theta}$ , the distributions of  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and |*S*7| vs *Sc* for the data of Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*) are replotted in figure 2 as a function of  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$ . Figure 2 shows that  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  follow approximately the behaviour  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}^{-1}$ for  $Sc > 10$  (or equivalently  $Pe_{\lambda\theta} > 257$ ). Namely, the flow approaches local isotropy as  $Pe_{\lambda\beta}^{-1}$  in the context of  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$ . We can observe that the behaviour of  $|S_3|$ ,  $|\tilde{S}_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  for  $Sc > 10$  in figures 1(*b*) and 2 is consistent with the prediction in (2.11).

<span id="page-7-0"></span>

[Figure](#page-12-12) 2. Dependence of  $|S_3|$  ( $\bullet$ , blue),  $|S_5|$  ( $\nabla$ , red) and  $|S_7|$  ( $\bullet$ ) on  $Pe_{\lambda_\theta}$  for  $Re_\lambda = 140$ . Lines: ∼ $Pe_{\lambda_\theta}^{-1}$ . The horizontal arrow indicates the region where  $Sc > 10$ ,  $S^*_{\theta}$  and  $|R_2|$  are approximately constant and the normalized 4th, 6th and 8th moments of scalar derivatives along directions parallel and perpendicular to the mean gradient are also approximately constant. The symbols correspond to the DNS d[ata](#page-5-1) [of](#page-5-1) Buaria *[et](#page-5-2) [al.](#page-5-2)* (20[21](#page-4-0)*a*).

#### 3. Discussion

Using dimensional analysis, Sreenivasan (2019), Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*) and Shete *et al.* (2022) have derived relations for  $|S_3|$  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  $|S_7|$  $|S_7|$ , i.e.

<span id="page-7-2"></span><span id="page-7-1"></span>
$$
|S_m| \sim Sc^{-1/2},\tag{3.1}
$$

 $(m = 3, 5, 7)$  at a given  $Re<sub>λ</sub>$ . On the other hand, using (2.14) and (2.15), [\(2.11\)](#page-11-7) can be rewri[tten as](#page-11-6)

$$
A_n = \sqrt{90} \frac{R_n S_\theta^*}{Re_\lambda} \left(\frac{C_{\varepsilon\theta}}{ScC_{\varepsilon}}\right)^{1/2}.
$$
 (3.2)

We recall  $|S_m| \sim A_n$  for  $Sc > 10$  (figures 1*b* and 2). Equation (3.2) can be reduced to (3.1), provided  $R_n$ ,  $S_\theta^*$  and  $C_{\varepsilon\theta}$  do not depend on *Sc* at a given  $Re_\lambda$ . As shown in figure 1(*a*),  $R_2$  and  $S_{\theta}^*$  are approximately constant for  $Sc > 10$ . However, the available data indicate that  $C_{\varepsilon\theta}$  decreases as *Sc* increases at a gi[ven](#page-7-1)  $Re_\lambda$  (Buaria, Yeung & Sawford 2016; Buaria *et al.* 2021*b*). In particular, Buaria *et al.* (2021*b*) showed that there is an empirical relation for  $C_{\varepsilon\theta}$  vs *Sc*, i.e.  $C_{\varepsilon\theta} = 1/\log Sc$ . They further showed that the  $1/\log Sc$  dependence can be replaced by a weak power-law relation, i.e.  $\sim Sc^{-0.1}$  (Buaria *et al.* 2021*a*). After introducing a ne[w diffu](#page-11-1)siv[e length s](#page-8-0)cale in their dimensional analysis, t[hey](#page-7-2) obtai[ned](#page-7-3)

<span id="page-7-3"></span>
$$
|S_m| \sim Sc^{-0.45}.\tag{3.3}
$$

However, substituting  $C_{\varepsilon\theta} \sim Sc^{-0.1}$  into (3.2), we obtain

$$
A_n \sim Sc^{-0.55},\tag{3.4}
$$

[which](https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2023.983) [shoul](https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2023.983)d be tenable for  $Sc > 10$ . We now plot  $|S_m|$  ( $m = 3, 5, 7$ ) vs *Sc* using the data of Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*) in figure 3. Also shown are the predictions of (3.3) and (3.4), i.e. <sup>∼</sup>*Sc*−0.<sup>45</sup> and <sup>∼</sup>*Sc*−0.55. Overall, (3.3) seems to be superior to (3.4) when the three data points for  $Sc < 10$  are included. However, since  $(3.4)$  only applies to the range  $Sc > 10$ ,

<span id="page-8-0"></span>

Figure 3. Dependence of  $|S_3|$  ( $\bullet$ , blue),  $|S_5|$  ( $\nabla$ , red) and  $|S_7|$  ( $\blacklozenge$ ) on *Sc* at *Re*<sub> $\lambda$ </sub> = 140. Solid Lines: ∼*Sc*<sup>−0.55</sup>, i.e. the prediction of (3.4). Dash-dotted lines: <sup>∼</sup>*Sc*−0.45, i.e. the prediction of (3.3). [The](#page-7-2) horiz[ontal](#page-7-3) arrow indicates the region where  $Sc > 10$ ,  $S_{\theta}^{*}$  and  $|R_{2}|$  are approximately co[nstant and t](#page-6-0)he normalized 4th, 6th and 8th moments of scalar derivatives along directions parallel and perpendicular to the mean gradient are also approximately constant. The symbols correspond to the DNS data of Buaria *et al.* [\(2021](#page-6-0)*a*).

we can conclude that both  $(3.3)$  and  $(3.4)$  provide similarly [adeq](#page-7-1)uate d[escription](#page-9-0)s of the data when  $Sc > 10$ .

[It is of in](#page-6-0)terest to explain the difference between the predictions of (3.3) and (3.4), i.e. <sup>∼</sup>*Sc*−0.<sup>45</sup> and <sup>∼</sup>*Sc*−0.<sup>55</sup> for *Sc* <sup>&</sup>lt; 10. We can observe from figure 1(*a*) that the variation of  $|R_2|$  [in th](#page-9-0)e range *Sc* = 1–10 is actually very small. However, the magnitude [of](#page-7-2)  $S^*_{\theta}$  increases from [1.78](#page-11-1) [to](#page-11-1) 2.22 when *Sc* increa[s](#page-7-1)es [fro](#page-7-1)m 1 to 8 at  $Re<sub>\lambda</sub> = 38$  (figure 1*a*); the magnitude of  $S^*_{\theta}$  appears to be independent of  $Re_{\lambda}$ , at least for  $Sc = 1$  (figure 4*a*). In order to take into account the impact of the variation of  $S^*_{\theta}$  at low *Sc* on (3.2), a power-law fit is used to the data of  $S^*_{\theta}$  at  $Re_{\lambda} = 38$ , 140 and 240. This fit is  $S^*_{\theta} = 1.79Sc^{0.1}$  (figure 4*a*). Note that, here, we are mainly interested in the range  $Sc = 1-10$  $Sc = 1-10$ . As discussed in the context of fig[ure 1\(](#page-11-1)*a*),  $S^*_{\theta}$  is approximately constant for  $Sc = 10-64$  (see al[so the](#page-11-1) blue symbols in figure 4*a*). Substituting  $C_{\varepsilon\theta} \sim Sc^{-0.1}$  (see the discussion in the context of (3.[3\)](#page-1-0) [or](#page-1-0) Buaria *et al.* 2021*a*) and  $S^*_{\theta} = 1.79Sc^{0.1}$  in (3.2), we obtain

<span id="page-8-2"></span><span id="page-8-1"></span>
$$
A_n \sim Sc^{-0.45},\tag{3.5}
$$

which is exactly the same as the prediction of  $(3.3)$ , i.e.  $\sim$ *Sc*<sup>−0.45</sup> proposed by Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*). A possible reason why the approach of Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*) and the present approach lead to the same prediction may be as follows. One of the key ingredients of the present approach is the use of the turbulent Péclet number  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$ , defined in (1.2), which can be written as a function of  $Re<sub>\lambda</sub>$ ,  $Sc$ ,  $C_{\varepsilon}$  and  $C_{\varepsilon\theta}$  (see (2.14) and (2.15)). Combining (1.2), (2.14) and (2.15), we can obtain

$$
Pe_{\lambda_{\theta}} = \frac{\overline{u_1^{2}}^{1/2} \lambda_{\theta}}{\kappa} = \frac{\overline{u_1^{2}}^{1/2} \lambda v \lambda_{\theta}}{\kappa v \lambda} = Re_{\lambda} Sc \frac{\lambda_{\theta}}{\lambda} = Re_{\lambda} \left(\frac{6ScR_{\theta}}{5}\right)^{1/2} = Re_{\lambda} \left(\frac{2ScC_{\varepsilon}}{5C_{\varepsilon\theta}}\right)^{1/2},
$$
\n(3.6)



<span id="page-9-0"></span>

Figure 4. (*a*) Dependence of  $S^*_{\theta}$  on *Sc* at  $Re_{\lambda} = 38$  ( $\nabla$ , blue), 140 (■) and 240 (○, red). Solid line: 1.79*Sc*<sup>0.1</sup>. The symbols correspond to the DNS data of Yeung *et al.* (2002). (*b*) Dependence of  $|S_3|$  ( $\bullet$ , blue),  $|S_5|$  ( $\nabla$ , red) and  $|S_7|$  ( $\bullet$ ) on *Sc* at *Re*<sub>λ</sub> = 140. Solid lines: ∼*Sc*<sup>−0.45</sup>, i.e. the prediction of (3.5). The symbols correspond to the DNS data of Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*).

which leads to

$$
\frac{\lambda_{\theta}}{\lambda} = \left(\frac{2C_{\varepsilon}}{5ScC_{\varepsilon\theta}}\right)^{1/2} \approx \left(\frac{2C_{\varepsilon}}{5Sc0.69Sc^{-0.1}}\right)^{1/2} = \left(\frac{2C_{\varepsilon}}{3.45}\right)^{1/2} Sc^{-0.45} = 0.52Sc^{-0.45}.
$$
\n(3.7)

The relations  $C_{\varepsilon\theta} \approx 0.69Sc^{-0.1}$  (estimated from figure 2 of Buaria *et al.* 2021*b*) and  $C_{\varepsilon}$  = 0.475 (Yeung & Zhou 1997) at  $Re_{\lambda} = 140$  have been used in (3.7). Equation (3.7) indicates that  $\lambda_{\theta}/\lambda$  should decrease as *Sc* increases. Further, su[bstituti](#page-11-1)ng (3.7) into the fourth term of (3.6) leads to  $Pe_{\lambda\theta} \approx 0.52Re_{\lambda}Sc^{0.55}$ . Evidently,  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$  is a function of  $Re_{\lambda}$  and *Sc*; a large  $Pe_{\lambda_{\theta}}$  can be obtained either by increasing *Sc* at a fixed *Re*<sub>λ</sub> or by increasing *Re*<sub>λ</sub> at a fixed *Sc*. The isotropic relation bet[ween](#page-11-1)  $\lambda$  and  $\eta$  is  $\lambda/\eta = 15^{1/4} Re_{\lambda}^{1/2}$ . Using this relation, (3.7) can be further written as

<span id="page-9-1"></span>
$$
\lambda_{\theta} \approx 0.52Sc^{-0.45}\lambda = Sc^{-0.45}Re_{\lambda}^{1/2}\eta.
$$
 (3.8)

On the other hand, the key i[ngredie](#page-10-0)[nt in Bua](#page-9-0)[ria](#page-8-2) *et al.* (2021*a*) is t[he in](#page-7-2)troduction of a new dif[fusiv](#page-8-2)e length scale, i.e.  $\eta_D = \eta Sc^{-0.45}$  (see their (4)). Th[erefor](#page-11-8)e,  $\lambda_\theta = \eta_D$  only when  $Re_{\lambda} = 1$ . Ho[wever](#page-7-2), it is interesting to note  $\lambda_{\theta} \sim \eta_D$  at any given  $Re_{\lambda}$ ; this is a possible reason why both Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*) and the present approach lead to the same prediction.

We conclude this section by examining the data of Shete *et al.* (2022) at much higher  $Re_\lambda$  (= 633) and *Sc* = 0.1, 0.7, 1 and 7. Since the maximum value of *Sc*(= 7) is relatively low, we here only test the prediction of (3.5) which includes the variation of  $S^*_{\theta}$  at low *Sc.* It can be observed from figure 5(*a*) that (3.5) is satisfied approximately for  $Sc \geq 0.7$ . [As was disc](https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2023.983)ussed in the context of figure  $4(b)$ , the prediction of  $(3.3)$  is the same as that of (3.5). It is worth mentioning that Buaria & Sreenivasan (2023) further examined the prediction of (3.3) in the context of  $|S_3|$ , i.e.  $|S_3| \sim Sc^{-0.45}$ , at  $Re_\lambda = 140$ , 390 and 633 and found that  $|S_3| \sim Sc^{-0.45}$  is satisfied approximately for  $Sc \gtrsim 3$  at all  $Re_\lambda$  (see their

<span id="page-10-0"></span>

Figure 5. (*a*) Dependence of  $|S_3|$  on *Sc* for  $Re_\lambda = 633$ . Line: 1.46*Sc*<sup>−0.45</sup>, i.e. the prediction of (3.5). (*b*) Dependence of  $|S_3|$  on  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$  at  $Re_\lambda = 633$ . Line: 175 $Pe_{\lambda\theta}^{-0.82}$ , i.e. the prediction of (3.10). The symbols in (*a*, *b*) correspond to the DNS data of Shete *et al.* (2022).

figure 1). Further, substituting  $S^*_{\theta} = 1.79Sc^{0.1}$  into (2.11) leads to

$$
A_n = \frac{6R_nS_\theta^*}{Pe_{\lambda_\theta}} = \frac{6R_n1.79Sc^{0.1}}{Pe_{\lambda_\theta}} \approx \frac{6R_n1.79}{Pe_{\lambda_\theta}} \left(\frac{Pe_{\lambda_\theta}}{0.52Re_\lambda}\right)^{0.1/0.55} \approx \frac{12.1R_n}{Re_\lambda^{0.18}} Pe_{\lambda_\theta}^{-0.82}.
$$
 (3.9)

We have used the relation  $Pe_{\lambda\theta} \approx 0.52 Re_{\lambda}Sc^{0.55}$  (see the discussion in the context of (3.6) and (3.7)) in the third step of (3.9). At any given *Re*λ, (3.9) can be simplified as

<span id="page-10-1"></span>
$$
A_n \sim Pe_{\lambda_\theta}^{-0.82}.\tag{3.10}
$$

Figure 5(*b*) shows that (3.10) is satisfied adequately for  $Pe_{\lambda\theta} \gtrsim 300$  (or equivalently for  $Sc \gtrsim 0.7$ ). It should be pointed out that all the data we used for our study were digitized from figures presented in Yeung *et al.* (2002), Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*) and Shete *et al.* (2022). Since all the DNS data reported here have already been published, the reader can find detailed descriptions of the simulation such as the spatial resolution in the original papers. We stress that the present paper focuses only on the  $Pe_{\lambda\theta}$  variation with *Sc* at several fixed  $Re<sub>\lambda</sub>$ , as shown in figure 1(*b*) ( $Re<sub>\lambda</sub> = 38$ ), figure 2 ( $Re<sub>\lambda</sub> = 144$ ) and figure 5(*b*) ( $Re<sub>\lambda</sub> = 633$ ). We do not assess any variation of small-scale quantities with *Re*λ at fixed *Sc*; this merits further investigation.

#### 4. Conclusions

Starting with the scalar transport equation for statistically stationary homogeneous isotropic turbulence with a uniform mean scalar gradient, we derived an expression for [describing the r](https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2023.983)elationship between the large-scale forcing associated with the mean scalar gradient and small-scale anisotropy reflected in the sum of the production and destruction

of (∂θ/∂*x*1) *<sup>n</sup>*+1; this sum is denoted *An* for convenience (see (2.12)). The departure of the scalar field from local isotropy due to the (large-scale) production arising from the mean

scalar gradient (whose normalized expression is denoted  $S^*_{\theta}$ ) can be quantified through [\(2.11](#page-7-2)). The [effe](#page-7-3)ct of  $S^*_{\theta}$  $S^*_{\theta}$  $S^*_{\theta}$  on local anisotropy c[an be reca](#page-6-0)st in the form  $R_n S^*_{\theta}/P e^{-1}_{\lambda_{\theta}}$  for  $n = 2, 4, 6$ . [S](#page-7-3)ince the available data show  $R_2$ ,  $S_\theta^*$  and the normalized 4th, 6th and 8th [moments](#page-8-0) of scalar derivatives are approximately constant for  $Sc \gtrsim 10$ , it is expected that, in the context of  $A_2$ ,  $A_4$  and  $A_6$ , the s[mall s](#page-8-2)cales of the passive scalar field will a[pproach](#page-11-1) [isotropy](#page-11-1) as rap[idly](#page-7-2) as  $Pe_{\lambda}^{-1}$  approaches zero. This is fully consistent with the DNS data for  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  vs  $Pe_{\lambda_\theta}$  for  $Sc > 10$ . This  $-1$  power-law decay for the normalized odd moments of the scalar derivative  $|S_3|$ ,  $|S_5|$  and  $|S_7|$  can be rewritten as a function of *Sc*, i.e. (3.4). Since  $|S_m|$  ∼ *A<sub>n</sub>* for *Sc* > 10 (figures 1*b* and 2), it is found that both (3.3) and (3.4) provide similarly adequate descriptions of  $|S_m|$  ( $m = 3, 5, 7$ ) when  $Sc > 10$ (figure 3). When the variation of  $S^*_{\theta}$ , mainly in the range  $Sc = 1-10$ , is taken into account, the resulting prediction ( $\sim$ *Sc*<sup>−0.45</sup>, or (3.5)) is the same as that of Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*) (∼*Sc*−0.45, or (3.3)). Further, the present approach complements that of Buaria *et al.* (2021*a*) who used dimensional arguments and introduced a new diffusive length scale.

Acknowledgements. S.L.T. thanks Professor M. de Bruyn Kops for the DNS data. We also thank Professor K.R. Sreenivasan for his constructive comments.

[Fu](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8614-3595)nding. [This research was supported by th](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8614-3595)e National Natural Science Foundation of China (project no. 91952109), Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (project no. 2023B1515020069) and Shenzhen Science and Technology Program (project nos. RCYX20210706092046085 and GXWD20220817171516009).

Declaration of interests. The authors report no conflict of interest.

#### <span id="page-11-5"></span>Author ORCIDs.

S.L. Tang https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6379-8505;

<span id="page-11-3"></span><span id="page-11-2"></span>L. Djenidi https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8614-3595.

#### **REFERENCES**

- <span id="page-11-6"></span><span id="page-11-1"></span>ABE, H., ANTONIA, R.A. & KAWAMURA, H. 2009 Correlation between small-scale velocity and scalar fluctuations in a turbulent channel flow. *J. Fluid Mech.* 627, 1–32.
- <span id="page-11-8"></span>ANTONIA, R.A. & BROWNE, L.W.B. 1983 The destruction of temperature fluctuations in a turbulent plane jet. *J. Fluid Mech.* 134, 67–83.
- <span id="page-11-7"></span>ANTONIA, R.A. & ORLANDI, P. 2003 Effect of S[chmidt number on s](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.05503)mall-scale passive scalar turbulence. *Appl. Mech. Rev.* 56 (6), 615–632.
- <span id="page-11-0"></span>BRETHOUWER, G., HUNT, J.C.R. & NIEUWSTADT, F.T.M. 2003 Micro-structure and Lagrangian statistics of the scalar field with a mean gradient in isotropic turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.* 474, 193–225.
- <span id="page-11-4"></span>BUARIA, D., CLAY, M.P., SREENIVASAN, K.R. & YEUNG, P.K. 2021*a* Small-scale isotropy and ramp-cliff structures in scalar turbulence. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 126 (3), 034504.
- BUARIA, D., CLAY, M.P., SREENIVASAN, K.R. & YEUNG, P.K. 2021*b* Turbulence is an ineffective mixer when Schmidt numbers are large. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 126 (7), 074501.
- BUARIA, D. & SREENIVASAN, K.R. 2023 Comparing velocity and passive scalar statistics in fluid turbulence at high Schmidt numbers and Reynolds numbers. arXiv:2302.05503.
- BUARIA, D., YEUNG, P.K. & SAWFORD, B.L. 2016 A Lagrangian study of turbulent mixing: forward and backward dispersion of molecular trajectories in isotropic turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.* 799, 352–382.
- CLAY, M. 2017 Strained turbulence and low-diffusivity turbulent mixing using high performance computing. PhD thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology.
- CORRSIN, S. 1951 On the spectrum of isotropic temperature fluctuations in an isotropic turbulence. *J. Appl. [Phys.](https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2023.983)* 22, 469–473.
- CORRSIN, S. 1952 Heat transfer in isotropic turbulence. *J. Appl. Phys.* 23 (1), 113–118.
- CORRSIN, S. 1953 Remarks on turbulent heat transfer: an account of some features of the phenomenon in fully turbulent regions. In *Proceedings of the first Iowa Thermodynamics Symposium*, pp. 5–30. State University of Iowa.
- <span id="page-12-17"></span><span id="page-12-15"></span><span id="page-12-9"></span><span id="page-12-2"></span>DONZIS, D.A., SREENIVASAN, K.R. & YEUNG, P.K. 2005 Scalar dissipation rate and dissipative anomaly in isotropic turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.* 532, 199–216.
- <span id="page-12-13"></span>GIBSON, C.H., FRIEHE, C.A. & MCCONNELL, S.O. 1977 Structure of sheared turbulent fields. *Phys. Fluids* 20, S156–S167.
- HOLZER, M. & SIGGIA, E.D. 1994 Turbulent mixing of a passive scalar. *Phys. Fluids* 6 (5), 1820–1837.
- <span id="page-12-12"></span>MESTAYER, P.G., GIBSON, C.H., COANTIC, M.F. & PATEL, A.S. 1976 Local anisotropy in heated and cooled turbulent boundary layers. *Phys. Fluids* 19, 1279–1287.

<span id="page-12-5"></span>MONIN, A.S. & YAGLOM, A.M. 2007 *Statistical Fluid Dynamics*, vol. 2. MIT.

- <span id="page-12-1"></span>OBUKHOV, A.M. 1949 Structure of the temperature field in turbulent flows. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Geogr. Geofiz* 13, 58–69.
- <span id="page-12-11"></span>PUMIR, A. 1994 A numerical study of the mixing of a passive scalar in three dimensions in the presence of a mean gradient. *Phys. Fluids* 6 (6), 2118–2132.
- <span id="page-12-4"></span>SCHUMACHER, J. & SREENIVASAN, K.R. 2003 Geometric features of the mixing of passive scalars at high Schmidt numbers. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91 (17), 174501.
- SHETE, K.P., BOUCHER, D.J., RILEY, J.J. & DE BRUYN KOPS, S.M. 2022 Effect of viscous-convective subrange on passive scalar statistics at high Reynolds number. *Phys. Rev. Fluids* 7 (2), 024601.

SHRAIMAN, B.I. & SIGGIA, E.D. 2000 Scalar turbulence. *Nature* 405 (6787), 639–646.

<span id="page-12-18"></span>SREENIVASAN, K. 1991 On local isotropy of passive scalars in turbulent shear flows. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* A 434, 165–182.

- <span id="page-12-0"></span>SREENIVASAN, K.R. 2019 Turbulent mixing: a perspective. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* 116 (37), 18175–18183.
- <span id="page-12-3"></span>SREENIVASAN, K.R. & ANTONIA, R.A. 1977 Skewness of temperature derivatives in turbulent shear flows. *Phys. Fluids* 20 (12), 1986–1988.
- <span id="page-12-6"></span>SREENIVASAN, K. & ANTONIA, R.A. 1997 The phenomenology of small-scale turbulence. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* 29, 435–472.
- SREENIVASAN, K.R., ANTONIA, R.A. & BRITZ, D. 1979 Local isotropy and large structures in a heated turbulent jet. *J. Fluid Mech.* 94 (4), 745–775.
- <span id="page-12-19"></span><span id="page-12-16"></span>SREENIVASAN, K.R. & TAVOULARIS, S. 1980 On the skewness of the temperature derivative in turbulent flows. *J. Fluid Mech.* 101 (4), 783–795.
- SUBRAMANIAN, C.S. & ANTONIA, R.A. 1982 A model for the skewness of the temperature derivative in a turbulent boundary layer. *Phys. Fluids* 25, 957–958.
- <span id="page-12-8"></span>TONG, C. & WARHAFT, Z. 1994 On passive scalar derivative statistics in grid turbulence. *Phys. Fluids* 6 (6), 2165–2176.
- <span id="page-12-10"></span>WARHAFT, Z. 2000 Passive scalars in turbulent flows. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* 32, 203–240.
- <span id="page-12-14"></span>WYNGAARD, J.C. 1971 The effect of velocity sensitivity on temperature derivative statistics in isotropic turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.* 48, 763–769.

WYNGAARD, J.C. 2010 *Turbulence in the Atmosphere*. Cambridge University Press.

- <span id="page-12-7"></span>YASUDA, T., GOTOH, T., WATANABE, T. & SAITO, I. 2020 Péclet-number dependence of small-scale anisotropy of passive scalar fluctuations under a uniform mean gradient in isotropic turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.* 898, A4.
- YEUNG, P.K., DONZIS, D.A. & SREENIVASAN, K.R. 2005 High-Reynolds-number simulation of turbulent mixing. *Phys. Fluids* 17, 081703.
- YEUNG, P.K. & SREENIVASAN, K.R. 2014 Direct numerical simulation of turbulent mixing at very low Schmidt number with a uniform mean gradient. *Phys. Fluids* 26 (1), 015107.
- YEUNG, P.K., XU, S., DONZIS, D.A. & SREENIVASAN, K.R. 2004 Simulations of three-dimensional turbulent mixing for Schmidt numbers of the order 1000. *Flow Turbul. Combust.* 72 (2), 333–347.
- YEUNG, P.K., XU, S. & SREENIVASAN, K.R. 2002 Schmidt number effects on turbulent transport with uniform mean scalar gradient. *Phys. Fluids* 14 (12), 4178–4191.
- YEUNG, P.K. & ZHOU, Y. 1997 Universality of the Kolmogorov constant in numerical simulations of turbulence. *Phys. Rev.* E 56, 1746–1752.